

## Comment Letter I1

---

**From:** djb83@netzero.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 18, 2018 8:55 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Airport "Expansion"

To Whom It May Concern:

By any normal definition of the word "expansion", lengthening the runway of an airport is EXPANDING the airport. Just because the footprint of the land encompassing the airport is not changing does not mean the airport is not becoming larger. If the intent of making a longer runway is to accommodate either more or larger planes, then the EXPANSION is clearly being done in order to EXPAND the capabilities of the airport. Obviously anyone with any common sense would understand this. Just as obvious to those of us who have common sense is the fact that the few people in a position of influence and political power want this to get done regardless of how any of us citizens feel. Bottom line is that if you want protests and law suits, you will get them. And when time comes for the next election in November, anyone associated with this semantic boondoggle will find himself out on the street.

I1-1

Don Burton  
7450 Esfera St  
Carlsbad, CA 92009  
760-753-7715

**Response to Letter I1****Don Burton****I1-1 Please refer to Master Response 5 (Airport Expansion/Public Vote).**

The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I2

---

**From:** Doug Fiske <dougkfiske@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 18, 2018 8:20 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Palomar

309 pages. How many people will read it? How many will even read the executive summary?

A great number of North County residents used Palomar for flights to and from Los Angeles and/or Phoenix. Those cities were the passengers' destination or an intermediate stop on the way to somewhere else. That service was enormously convenient.

What the huge majority of passengers want to know: Is service to Los Angeles and/or Phoenix coming back?

I searched the document for LAX and Los Angeles but failed to find the answer.

I2-1

**Response to Letter I2****Doug Fiske**

- I2-1** This comment does not an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I3

---

**From:** Matt Turner <matt\_turner1@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 19, 2018 10:02 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Feedback for new airport from 17 year homeowner and lifelong resident of Carlsbad.

Hi, Our family has lived in the same house near the airport for 17 years and my wife was born and raised here in Carlsbad. Our feedback is:

- we prefer you DO NOT lengthen the runway.
- the runway seems to accommodate business/corporate/private jets and planes just fine and even cal jet elite so we don't feel the need for increasing the length of the runway.
- adding an emas safety system is a nice safety thing to add for the jets, so we are not opposed to that
- we are part of the "general aviation" community so we would love to see some more hangars available - maybe adding some to the northside? I personally would lease a hangar and run my business out of it.

I3-1

Thanks!  
-Matt

**Response to Letter I3****Matt Turner**

- I3-1** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I4

**From:** Tanja F <tanja.freeman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 20, 2018 10:17 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Proposed Master Plan -Input

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to give my input on the Proposed Master Plan. I'm all in favor of all of the airport safety plans proposed in the new plan, but I would like to see a specific change to the plan.

Currently the plan calls for a **Voluntary** Noise Abatement Procedure. I would like to see this changed to **Mandatory** (but with the exception for bad weather). We live in a noise sensitive area, that is not supposed to be under the flight path, are in a designated noise sensitive area (according to the map), but daily, jet pilots are taking a short cut over our area. They brake, turn and fly lower over the area near Melrose and Sunset in Vista. It is LOUD outside the house and inside as well. Add layers of helicopters, smaller planes, etc (up to 5 aircraft concentrated over our little valley at a time) and it is entirely unreasonable.

If pilots were to stick to the original flight plan as outlined in past, present and future plans, complaints would drop and residents would be in more favor of an increase in air traffic/airport expansion. Right now there is no incentive to work with us (the residents of the areas that they fly over) because the noise abatement is only listed as voluntary. Please make change to restore balance, keep the peace, and make this a great place for everyone. Let's work together to grow together. Thanks!!

-Tanja Freeman

I4-1

**Response to Letter I4****Tanja Freeman**

- I4-1** The commenter would like to see implementation of mandatory noise abatement procedures. As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, the Federal Aviation Administration has jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight. Accordingly, neither the County nor the City of Carlsbad has the authority to implement mandatory noise abatement procedures at the Airport. Please also refer to **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)**.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff researched the location provided by this comment and confirmed the location is outside of the 65dB contour (i.e., less than 65dB) under all scenarios. Specifically, the existing noise condition at the location provided was estimated to be 42.61dB, and its future condition without the Proposed Project is estimated to be 42.26dB. Assuming full implementation of the Proposed Project (PAL 2), the estimated future noise condition would be 43.08dB. This is below the threshold of significance of 65dB CNEL. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Therefore, because the location would be outside of the 65dB contour, no significant noise impacts would occur, and no changes to the PEIR are required. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.



## Comment Letter I5

---

**From:** Karen Johnson <kajohnson74@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 20, 2018 10:32 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Airport MAster Plan comment

I very much want regular commercial service at McClellan-Palomar Airport. Regular commercial service is necessary to attract business, which bring jobs and improves the tax base. A local airport may also bring in more tourists from out of state who don't want to rent a car to drive from LAX.

The United flights from here to LAX were a great service for me. Without those flights, I need to drive to LAX or San Diego, adding to the snarled traffic on the freeway, and increasing pollution.

I hope the city will work with airlines to make Carlsbad an attractive city for them to service.

I5-1

Karen A. Johnson  
7307 San Bartolo St  
Carlsbad, CA 92011

**Response to Letter I5****Karen Johnson**

- I5-1** This comment does not an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I6

---

**From:** Lynda Barrett <richardbarrett773@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 21, 2018 4:20 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Carlsbad PA master plan

Hi,

Quoting from the master plan:

'Currently, American Eagle operates out of one of the trailer with five daily flights to and from Los Angeles International Airport. American Eagle is currently utilizing the 19 passenger Jetstream 31 aircraft. The other trailer is utilized by United Express, with five daily flights to and from Los Angeles International Airport. United Express utilizes the 19 passenger Beech 1900 air craft.'

I6-1

Actually NO commercial airline flies directly from Carlsbad to LAX. Please advise.

Thanks,

Lynda Barrett

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**Response to Letter I6****Lynda Barrett**

- I6-1** The quote provided by the commenter is not included in the Master Plan Update. It is possible the commenter obtained a previous version of the Master Plan Update; however, the most current and publicly available version was posted on the County's website and distributed to various local libraries in March 2018. Please refer to the final Master Plan Update Section 3.5.1 (Airline Service) for a discussion of commercial airline service. Regardless, this comment does not identify an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required.

## Comment Letter I7

---

**From:** SCAA <debic@socalaviation.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 1:13 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Airport update

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi, I am with the SoCal Aviation Association and live near the CRQ airport. I received a message on the Next Door app about an upcoming open house on airport plan. I was wondering if you could keep me in the loop to let our members know of updates and maybe work with our local business aviation community for support and maybe offer exhibit space for companies on the airport to educate people on what we do and career opportunities?

I7-1

Warm Regards,

Debi Carpenter  
Executive Director  
SCAA  
760-390-7486

**Response to Letter I7****Debi Carpenter**

- I7-1** The County will include the SoCal Aviation Association on all noticing for the proposed Master Plan Update process and the PEIR. This comment does not raise specific issues regarding the substantive environmental analysis conducted within the PEIR. The comment will be included as part of the administrative record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I8

**From:** Dee Forsberg, Global Hire <Dee@globalhire.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 2:00 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Palomar Airport

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Delinda Forsberg and I am a long-term resident of Carlsbad. I am very concerned about the airport expansion and I know as an organization, you have been very careful to avoid using the term expansion, but that is exactly what it is. Residents of Carlsbad have the legal "right" to vote on "any" expansion of the airport, including extending the runway, making buildings larger to accommodate increased passengers, etc.

I8-1

I have asthma, a history of severe lung issues and there are so many times in a day when I am having to use my inhaler more frequently, I can't even hear the TV or talk on the phone, because of the sound of jets flying over. Several that have been dangerously low. I've called to report my concerns, which has proven to be a waste of time.

Neighbors have all of a sudden smelled jet fuel in their yards, grass has been burnt by fuel drops, etc.. Let alone you will be decreasing the value of our properties, putting the lives of children and adults at risk.

I8-2

I am strongly opposed to your actions and demand that any future development at the airport be put to a vote by the residents.

I8-3

Sincerely,

Delinda Forsberg



*A full-cycle executive search firm focusing on recruiting mid-level to executive management professionals*

Dee@GlobalHire.org - (760) 214-7458  
 Licensed and Insured

**Response to Letter I8****Delinda Forsberg**

- I8-1** Please refer to **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)** and **Master Response 5 (Airport Expansion/Public Vote)**.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff researched the location provided by this comment and confirmed the location is outside of the 65dB contour (i.e., less than 65dB) under all scenarios. Specifically, the existing noise condition at the location provided was estimated to be 50.42dB, and its future condition without the Proposed Project is estimated to be 51.56dB. Assuming full implementation of the Proposed Project (PAL 2), the estimated future noise condition would be 52.66dB. This is below the threshold of significance of 65dB CNEL. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Therefore, because the location would be outside of the 65dB contour, no significant noise impacts would occur, and no changes to the PEIR are required. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.

- I8-2** The County acknowledges these comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required.
- I8-3** The County acknowledges this comment, and it has been included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.



## Comment Letter I9

**From:** Hope Nelson <hopen51@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 4:51 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP; Lardy, Lee Ann; Nick.Alex@sdcounty.ca.gov; Curtis, Cynthia  
**Cc:** Mark.Packard@carlsbadca.gov; Michael.Schumacher@carlsbadca.gov; Keith Blackburn; Cori Schumacher; Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; jason.haber@carlsbadca.gov  
**Subject:** McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Public Comment Period

To the attention of Cynthia Curtis, Leeann Lardy and Nick Alex:

I am writing to request an extension of the Public Response Period for the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and associated documents. My reasoning regarding why this serves the community is as follows. I think you will find it both logical and perhaps, as I did, astounding.

1. After 4 years of County effort on the project, the County neglected to publish a date certain for the release of the documents prior to their release. Surely the County knew when these documents would be released and could have begun the notification process weeks prior. That said, it simply was not done. It takes time for citizens to become aware, after so many previous delays, that these documents have finally been released.

2. Per Nick Alex's presentation of the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan at the January 18 PAAC Meeting, the County, using its email list, sent out only somewhere around 2,600 emails informing the public of the Document's release. The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan outcome will impact approximately 215,000 people living within the Airport's impact area. The County has a fiduciary responsibility to its community and should be making a stronger effort to communicate with ALL CITIZENS who may be impacted by the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan.

3. The documents total 3529 pages. That is an extremely large amount of dense, technical data. Further, technical experts and County staff took 4 years to prepare the docs. Those involved have specific technical expertise in their fields. The expectation that many lay citizens will get through this long, dense and highly technical doc in the current 45 day Public Comment Period is completely unrealistic.

4. Current access to the Master Plan docs is online only. Copies that, per Nick, were to be provided to libraries are not yet available in Carlsbad. I personally checked Fri, 1/19/18, approx. 3pm. I would suggest the County needs to facilitate the availability of hard copy to many more public locations in the cities of Carlsbad, Vista, San Marcos and Oceanside. We have already lost 4 days from the tightly formulated schedule. Also, there needs to be a provision for the County to make hard copies available at County cost for those who request them.

5. The only item regarding submitting comments is this, from [www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/airports/palomar/masterplan.html](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/airports/palomar/masterplan.html) :

## Public Review Comments

E-mail: [PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov)

Mail: County of San Diego, Department of Public Works  
Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

Nowhere is there any information delineating the EIR Process, instructions, or any format within which to comment. This lack of information is unacceptable as the County is making a real effort to obtain community response. This needs to be corrected.

The proposed McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan will most likely have more impact on more people and the future of the San Diego North County than any other singular development in the area. Because the roll out of the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan does not match with the impact of Plan, I respectfully request an extension of 100 days from the date the above distribution and facilitations have been made.

I9-1  
cont.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Hope Nelson

C4fa Steering Committee

Carlsbad Citizen

**Response to Letter I9**

**Hope Nelson**

- I9-1** Please refer to **Master Response 2 (Public Review Period Extension)**. No further response is required.

## Comment Letter I10

---

**From:** ffoulks@outlook.com  
**Sent:** Friday, January 26, 2018 7:10 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Cc:** fred foulks  
**Subject:** Carlsbad Airport Master Plan

Dear Palomar Airport

First, let me thank you for getting new air service into Palomar.  
When I flew out several years ago, United Express was providing the service.  
I had been in the area on a visit to see friends.

As a outsider who has used both San Diego International and Palomar both are nice airports to fly in and out of.

My Suggestion would be to relocate the airport (If Possible to a location that is more centralized and closer to major highways and use that location as a possible  
Second reliever airport to SAN. IF not, Maybe by land around the airport to extend the runway to at least 6500ft -7000ft to accommodate larger jet aircraft.

Also, Would be beneficial to see about getting Delta, AA in to provide connection service to cities where travelers can connect and not have to fly into SAN which is 60 plus minutes north of San Diego.  
Possibly also look at future Terminal and gate options ( Jet ways ) in the future.

Airfield: LED Taxiway, LED High Intensity Runway Lighting and Category 1 Approach lights maybe event centerline lights in the future during Fog, Rain and bad weather. I know Southern Cal gets a lot of sunny days but when you do get the bad weather it can get rough.

I firmly believe San Diego County can sustain a second airport (If land is available to do so within the area.  
Possibly, There are other airports nearby that have expansion capacity where Palomar does not.

Final Suggestion, Keep Palomar as is with upgrades to infrastructure and build or relocate Passenger traffic to a nearby airport that has more capacity infrastructure wise and make Palomar a Executive Airport for private jets etc.

Just some ideas based on my experience traveling through your airports. Both of which are easy to navigate, make connections and when I flew through had excellent customer service.

Thank you for your time and best of luck on your Master Plan at Palomar.

One more question: Are Their Plans to relocate San Diego International Airport in the future? If not, What are the current future plans for SAN?

Thank you for your time and I hope hear back from the Planning Team soon.

All The Best,  
Fred Foulks  
Email: [ffoulks@outlook.com](mailto:ffoulks@outlook.com)  
Alternate Email: [fredfoulks@yahoo.com](mailto:fredfoulks@yahoo.com)  
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

I10-1

**Response to Letter I10****Fred Foulks**

- I10-1** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

It is important to note that the PEIR Chapter 4 (Project Alternatives) did consider relocating the Airport to an alternate location or transferring commercial services to another airport. In summary, the County concluded that relocating the Airport to an alternate location or transferring services to another airport fails to meet any of the Proposed Project objectives as outlined in the PEIR Section 1.1 and was not considered further.

## Comment Letter I11

---

**From:** PHYLLIS ROCK <pdrock07@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 26, 2018 5:37 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Paomar Airport

Do it now fast pace it not 20 years, 5 or less years, we need the Palomar Airport to be in the current century now.  
not later.

Alan Rock  
760/473-5983

I11-1

**Response to Letter I11****Alan Rock**

- I11-1** The County acknowledges this comment and support for the Project; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I12

---

**From:** Robert Riordan <robert.alan.riordan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 28, 2018 7:41 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Updates to airport?

A couple key questions related to the new master plan:

1. Will it drive additional commercial traffic to the airport - eg Alaska Airlines to Cabo, SF, or other quick destinations?
2. Will it still be a reasonably priced place for my daughter and I to learn to fly together when she is 16?
3. Will there be any kid-friendly components to the open houses?

I12-1

Thanks!

Regards,  
Rob

Sent from [Outlook](#)



**Response to Letter I12****Rob Riordan**

- I12-1** The County acknowledges the comments and support for the Project; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I13

---

**From:** Diane Hemelstrand <dhemelstrand@financeofamerica.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2018 12:03 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Palomar airport

I loved the old airport but realize it was time to update. My question is ...why did you extend the runway several years ago and then after all the money was spent on improvements United no longer used the airport. It seems it was a benefit to the private jets not for the public. I would love to fly out of Carlsbad again. But flying to Vegas is not the answer for me personally.

I13-1

Secondly, I do not think private jets should be able to shorten their approach to land by flying over our neighborhood in Rancho Carrillo. That is NOT the original plan when we purchased our home 17 years ago.

I13-2

Thank you

Diane Hemelstrand

**Disclaimer**

This message and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information and are only for the use of the intended recipient of this message. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by return email, and delete or destroy this and all copies of this message and all attachments. Any unauthorized disclosure, use, distribution, or reproduction of this message or any attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd.**

**Response to Letter I13****Diane Hemelstrand**

- I13-1** The County acknowledges the comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. The County will include the comment as part of the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.
- I13-2** Regarding aircraft in flight, please refer to **Master Response 3 (VNAP)** and **Master Response 7 (FAA Involvement and Oversight)**. No further response is required.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff reviewed this comment for any site-specific location data of the perceived noise. However, the comment does not contain a sufficient location for the County to further study or analyze the noted noise concerns. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.

## Comment Letter I14

---

**From:** stephanie Jackel <sjackel@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2018 11:44 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Attn: Cynthia Curtis

Dear Ms. Curtis,

I am writing to protest the extremely short comment period that has been allowed for citizen response to the McClellan-Palomar Airport Draft EIR document.

The EIR is a very large, very dense document and will require careful reading to develop comments in response. The original date – March 5<sup>th</sup> – and even the extended date – March 19<sup>th</sup> – are not nearly enough time for this.

I am requesting that San Diego County extend the comment deadline to a total of 3 months' time for county residents to read the EIR properly and send in their comments.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Jackel  
1500 Green Oak Road  
Vista 92081

I14-1

**Response to Letter I14**

**Stephanie Jackel**

**I14-1** Please refer to **Master Response 2 (Public Review Period Extension)**. No further response is required.

## Comment Letter I15

**From:** Marcinko, Marie C. <marie.marcinko@thermofisher.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2018 6:00 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Cc:** geezokman@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Palomar Airport

Hi Cynthia

I am submitting my comments for the Palomar Airport Master Plan.

I am not in favor of the master plan based on what I have seen in my community since late August, early Sept of 2017. I live on 914 Caminito Madrigal Unit G and am located near Paseo Del Norte. In early Sept, when CalJet began flying, there was a significant change in flight paths for prop planes and jets.

Ever since Sept I have heard nothing but constant plane noise throughout the day and into the night. It has become unbearable. I have lived in the same Carlsbad condo for fourteen years and have never experienced this type of excessive and consistent noise. This occurs every day and even during the "voluntary quiet hours" that the airport suggests for the pilots to follow.

Below are just a few of the reasons that I am asking that the airport does not go forward with this plan until some sort of resolution is agreed upon by the community.

1. I cannot open my doors and windows because the noise from the propeller planes is so frequent and loud that I cannot carry on phone conversations for my business.
2. Jets and propeller planes do not follow the suggested quiet hours. In addition, flying can begin as early as 6am and wake my husband and I up during the week as well as on weekends. Because I am in sales, I work late and do not retire until 1 or 2am.
3. Both the jets and the propeller planes do not follow the suggested flight paths and consistently fly over our complex when they should not be taking this route. When they do fly directly over our complex or near the noise is excruciating loud.
4. Below is a three hour time frame on Oct 23rd of what I am being subjected to during the day. Almost all flying directly over our complex. Furthermore, it has only become worse since October.

Plane noise on 10/23/17

I began to document the planes in the afternoon.

12:00pm	twin engine
12:02pm	twin engine
12:13pm	twin engine
12:15pm	twin engine
12:17pm	twin engine
12:18pm	twin engine
12:21pm	twin engine
12:27pm	twin engine
12:30pm	twin engine
12:32pm	twin engine
12:35pm	twin engine
12:39pm	twin engine
12:40pm	jet
12:45pm	twin engine
12:46pm	twin engine
12:47pm	jet

I15-1

12:51pm twin engine  
12:53pm twin engine  
1:08pm twin engine  
1:10pm twin engine  
1:12pm jet  
1:20pm twin engine

As I reach out to the community using social media, I have been made aware that there are many individuals noticing the significant noise increase in recent months. Furthermore, I have reached out to Jessica Turner, Community outreach director, at the Palomar Airport. Even though she has been very responsive to my questions, there is very little that she can do change this serious issue.

Therefore, as a long-time resident of Carlsbad, I am asking you to not go forward and lengthen the runway at this time. With even more future flights planned, as well as a new airline coming aboard in May, there needs to be a discussion between residents and the airport on how we can work together and come up with a positive solution for both parties. It is unethical that we as residents are now being subjected to 20X-30X increase in plane noise produced by both the propeller planes, CalJet and private aircraft. A restricted flight path and quiet hours must be implemented as the airport continues to grow. If not, this issue will become even more of a problem as flights increase, heavier payload planes are utilized and the issue will not just be in my complex, but will affect every neighborhood that lies in the flight path(s).

As I am writing this email to you at ~6pm, six planes flew overhead in about a 20 min time span. This has to change. I will not be the last person to comment/complain about this issue.

Thank you,

**Marie Marcinko M.S.**  
Chemical Application Specialist  
Fisher Scientific

Thermo Fisher Scientific  
300 Industry Drive | Pittsburgh, PA 15275  
Mobile: +1 (760) 450-6892  
Customer Service: +1 (866) 374-8225 | +1 (800) 766-7000  
[marie.marcinko@thermofisher.com](mailto:marie.marcinko@thermofisher.com) | [www.fishersci.com](http://www.fishersci.com)

I15-1  
cont.

**Response to Letter I15****Marie Marcinko**

- I15-1** The commenter states that restrictive flight paths and quiet hours must be implemented at the Airport. As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, the Federal Aviation Administration has jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight. Accordingly, neither the County nor the City of Carlsbad has the authority to implement mandatory noise abatement procedures. Please also refer to **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)**.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff researched the location provided by this comment and confirmed the location is outside of the 65dB contour (i.e., less than 65dB) under all scenarios. Specifically, the existing noise condition at the location provided was estimated to be 49.84dB, and its future condition without the Proposed Project is estimated to be 50.99dB. Assuming full implementation of the Proposed Project (PAL 2), the estimated future noise condition would be 52.15dB. This is below the threshold of significance of 65dB CNEL. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Therefore, because the location would be outside of the 65dB contour, no significant noise impacts would occur, and no changes to the PEIR are required. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.



## Comment Letter I16



The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available for a public review and comment period from Thursday, January 18 to Monday, March 19, 2018. The documents are accessible at: [www.PalomarAirportMP.com](http://www.PalomarAirportMP.com).

Comments must be submitted to:

Email:  
PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov

Mail:  
County of San Diego, Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

If you wish to submit written comments this evening, please complete this form.  
You may also submit comments after tonight, but no later than March 19, 2018.

Name:	CHRIS FITZGERALD
Title/Organization:	RESIDENT
Email:	
Phone Number:	
Mailing Address:	6793 OREIDIAN PL, CARLSBAD CA 92009
Project Comments:	<p>I LIVE 1.5 MILES FROM THE AIRPORT. I FREQUENTLY HAVE AIRCRAFT &amp; HELICOPTERS FLY OVER MY HOUSE. I BELIEVE IN THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF IMPROVING THE AIRPORT'S INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT CURRENT USERS. I ENDORSE &amp; REQUEST THE APPROVAL OF THE MASTER PLAN AS PROPOSED.</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please send me project notifications

I16-1

**Response to Letter I16****Chris Fitzherald**

- I16-1** The County acknowledges this comment and support for the Project; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I17



The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available for a public review and comment period from Thursday, January 18 to Monday, March 19, 2018. The documents are accessible at: [www.PalomarAirportMP.com](http://www.PalomarAirportMP.com).

Comments must be submitted to:

Email:  
PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov

Mail:  
County of San Diego, Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

If you wish to submit written comments this evening, please complete this form.  
You may also submit comments after tonight, but no later than March 19, 2018.

Name:	CHRISTINE FRANZ
Title/Organization:	
Email:	CHRISTINE@AGFRANZ.COM
Phone Number:	609.963.3639
Mailing Address:	3625 VISTA OCEANA, UNIT 39, OCEANSIDE, CA 92057
Project Comments:	<p>I BELIEVE THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE EXCELLENT! SAFETY IS KEY WITH FLYING &amp; YOU'RE MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please send me project notifications	

I17-1

**Response to Letter I17****Christine Franz**

- I17-1** The County acknowledges this comment and support for the Project; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I18



The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available for a public review and comment period from Thursday, January 18 to Monday, March 19, 2018. The documents are accessible at: [www.PalomarAirportMP.com](http://www.PalomarAirportMP.com).

Comments must be submitted to:

Email:  
PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov

Mail:  
County of San Diego, Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

If you wish to submit written comments this evening, please complete this form.  
You may also submit comments after tonight, but no later than March 19, 2018.

Name:	Stephanie Naff
Title/Organization:	
Email:	northcolec@roadrunner.com
Phone Number:	
Mailing Address:	
Project Comments:	<p>Re: your point</p> <p>① Please clarify your traffic impact in the 2 seconds doesn't help. We need the # of cars (Palomar Road is maxed out) A visual</p> <p>② Please add another aerial photo showing more houses in the area? (i.e. the ones affected)</p> <p>(An FAA rep would be helpful)</p>
	<div style="text-align: right;">I18-1</div> <div style="text-align: right;">I18-2</div>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please send me project notifications	



# McClellan-Palomar Airport

Public Review Workshop



Project Comments:

Question  
 (3) Will more commercial jets (on tight schedules) cause smaller plane <sup>(during take off)</sup> to have to head north or south before <sup>reaching</sup> the Pacific - ~~it~~ causing the smaller planes to cut N or south ~~and~~ & sooner & fly over houses? Smaller planes are louder & I've never felt the fear of plane landing in my condo as much as I have now and I've lived off Paseo del Norte for 21 years.

Thank you  
 Stephanie  
 North

118-3

**Response to Letter I18****Stephanie North**

- I18-1** The PEIR was prepared in accordance with the City of Carlsbad & San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council (SANTEC) guidance, which identify that traffic analysis is based, in part, on the number of seconds that would create delay caused by a project. As such, no revisions have been made to the PEIR.
- I18-2** The comment requests another aerial image showing more residences around the Airport. The PEIR includes aerial images surrounding the Airport as applicable for studying each environmental resource defined by CEQA. As this comment does not identify a specific environmental issue with the PEIR analysis, no changes to the PEIR have been made in response to this comment.
- I18-3** The County's Proposed Project would not affect the existing aircraft flight paths. As explained in **Master Response 7 (FAA Involvement and Oversight)**, aircraft in flight are under the jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement of FAA.

## Comment Letter I19



The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available for a public review and comment period from Thursday, January 18 to Monday, March 19, 2018. The documents are accessible at: [www.PalomarAirportMP.com](http://www.PalomarAirportMP.com).

Comments must be submitted to:

Email:  
PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov

Mail:  
County of San Diego, Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

If you wish to submit written comments this evening, please complete this form.  
You may also submit comments after tonight, but no later than March 19, 2018.

Name:	GARY POLSTER
Title/Organization:	
Email:	gpolster@sbcglobal.net
Phone Number:	760 720-0810
Mailing Address:	4358 TUOLUMNE PL, CHULA VISTA CA. 92010
Project Comments:	<p>I AM VERY CONCERNED THAT AIRCRAFT CALL LAND AT ALL HOURS. LINDBERGH HAS A 10:00 PM LIMIT AND I FEEL PALOMAR SHOULD BE THE SAME</p> <p>ALSO, THERE SHOULD BE MORE CONTROL OF THE FLIGHT TRACKS, EVEN FOR <del>BOB</del> CRAFT FLYING LOW - THE NOISE IS WORSE WITH THOSE PLANES. THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED OVER HOUSES.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, please send me project notifications	

I19-1



**Response to Letter I19****Gary Polster**

- I19-1** The commenter states that quiet hours must be implemented similar to Lindbergh Field (now called San Diego International Airport). Please refer to Master **Response 3 (Voluntary Noise Abatement Procedures)** and **Master Response 7 (FAA Involvement and Oversight)**. Furthermore, this comment does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff researched the location provided by this comment and confirmed the location is outside of the 65dB contour (i.e., less than 65dB) under all scenarios. Specifically, the existing noise condition at the location provided was estimated to be 38.11dB, and its future condition without the Proposed Project is estimated to be 38.00dB. Assuming full implementation of the Proposed Project (PAL 2), the estimated future noise condition would be 38.94dB. This is below the threshold of significance of 65dB CNEL. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Therefore, because the location would be outside of the 65dB contour, no significant noise impacts would occur, and no changes to the PEIR are required. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.

## Comment Letter I20



The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available for a public review and comment period from Thursday, January 18 to Monday, March 19, 2018. The documents are accessible at: [www.PalomarAirportMP.com](http://www.PalomarAirportMP.com).

Comments must be submitted to:

**Email:**  
PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Mail:**  
County of San Diego, Attn: Cynthia Curtis  
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

If you wish to submit written comments this evening, please complete this form.  
You may also submit comments after tonight, but no later than March 19, 2018.

Name:	Tim Stripe
Title/Organization:	
Email:	
Phone Number:	
Mailing Address:	
Project Comments:	give the residents A chance to vote on the airport ✓
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please send me project notifications	

I20-1

**Response to Letter I20****Tim Stripe**

- I20-1** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. However, it should be noted, the proposed improvements to the Airport are not considered an expansion of the Airport within the scope of City of Carlsbad's regulatory framework. Please refer to **Master Response 5 (Airport Expansion/Public Vote)**.

## Comment Letter I21

---

**From:** Lynell Ciranna <lynellc@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 31, 2018 2:46 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** McClellen Airport - EIR Time period for comment

Dear Ms. Curtis,

I am writing to request that San Diego County extend the McClellen-Palomar airport expansion EIR comment deadline to a total of 3 months time, so that residents have ample time to read the EIR properly and then have time to send in their comments.

The EIR is a long and complicated document. It requires careful reading and note taking along the way. Even the extended date of March 19th does not allow for enough time to thoroughly investigate all aspects of the document.

Please consider this request so that all we might have ample time to digest such a big and important document.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

I21-1

*Lynell Ciranna*  
*1979 Oxford Ct, Vista, CA*

**Response to Letter 21**

**Lynell Ciranna**

**I21-1** Please refer to **Master Response 2 (Public Review Period Extension)**. No further response is required.

## Comment Letter I22

**From:** Hope Nelson <hopen51@att.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 02, 2018 4:46 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP; Lardy, Lee Ann; Curtis, Cynthia  
**Cc:** Mark.Packard@carlsbadca.gov; Michael.Schumacher@carlsbadca.gov; Keith Blackburn; Cori Schumacher; Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; jason.haber@carlsbadca.gov  
**Subject:** Extended MP Airport Master Plan Public Comment Period  
**Attachments:** MPAirport comment period1.pdf

To the attention of Cynthia Curtis and Leeann Lardy:

Re: Extended timeframe McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan and EIR comment period

Thank you for the extended public review and comment period related to the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan and EIR. I understand that you have extended the comment period for two weeks, ending March 19, 2018.

Though appreciative of the two extra weeks, am underwhelmed by the length of the extended period. It would be far more beneficial to our County to encourage public comment so as to hear the voice of the citizens on such a major undertaking as the McClellan-Palomar Airport "20 Year Plan".

It appears the County is making every effort to ensure the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan is completed within some sort of pre-determined or strategic deadline. What causes this deadline to be more important than hearing and considering the larger amount and scope of input a longer period of comment would encourage? After spending an enormous amount of time and public money, after numerous County delays in releasing the Master Plan and EIR to the citizens for study, intentionally not disclosing in advance the release date of the documents so that citizens would be aware, it is unbelievable that the public comment period is anything less than 90-100 days.

I22-1

I remind you that the issue of a lack of information regarding delineating the EIR Process, instructions, or any format within which to comment has not been addressed. Also the availability of hard copy of the documents is still lacking. All of the reasons for my original request still stand.

I urge you to reconsider and establish a more reasonable deadline for an extended public comment period. I continue to suggest 100 days. After all, the deadline for the release was extended many multiple times by the County.

Attached is my original request for your review.

Hope Nelson

C4fa Steering Committee

Carlsbad Citizen

**Comment Letter I22  
Exhibit**
**Hope Nelson**

**From:** Hope Nelson <hopen51@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 4:51 PM  
**To:** 'PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov'; 'Leeann.Lardy@sdcounty.ca.gov';  
 'Nick.Alex@sdcounty.ca.gov'; Cynthia.Curtis@sdcounty.ca.gov  
**Cc:** Mark.Packard@carlsbadca.gov; Michael.Schumacher@carlsbadca.gov; Keith Blackburn  
 (keith.blackburn@carlsbadca.gov); Cori Schumacher (cori.schumacher@carlsbadca.gov);  
 Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; jason.haber@carlsbadca.gov  
**Subject:** McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Public Comment Period

To the attention of Cynthia Curtis, Leeann Lardy and Nick Alex:

I am writing to request an extension of the Public Response Period for the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update and associated documents. My reasoning regarding why this serves the community is as follows. I think you will find it both logical and perhaps, as I did, astounding.

1. After 4 years of County effort on the project, the County neglected to publish a date certain for the release of the documents prior to their release. Surely the County knew when these documents would be released and could have begun the notification process weeks prior. That said, it simply was not done. It takes time for citizens to become aware, after so many previous delays, that these documents have finally been released.
2. Per Nick Alex's presentation of the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan at the January 18 PAAC Meeting, the County, using it's email list, sent out only somewhere around 2,600 emails informing the public of the Document's release. The McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan outcome will impact approximately 215,000 people living within the Airport's impact area. The County has a fiduciary responsibility to its community and should be making a stronger effort to communicate with ALL CITIZENS who may be impacted by the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan.
3. The documents total 3529 pages. That is an extremely large amount of dense, technical data. Further, technical experts and County staff took 4 years to prepare the docs. Those involved have specific technical expertise in their fields. The expectation that many lay citizens will get through this long, dense and highly technical doc in the current 45 day Public Comment Period is completely unrealistic.
4. Current access to the Master Plan docs is online only. Copies that, per Nick, were to be provided to libraries are not yet available in Carlsbad. I personally checked Fri, 1/19/18, approx. 3pm. I would suggest the County needs to facilitate the availability of hard copy to many more public locations in the cities of Carlsbad, Vista, San Marcos and Oceanside. We have already lost 4 days from the tightly formulated schedule. Also, there needs to be a provision for the County to make hard copies available at County cost for those who request them.

5. The only item regarding submitting comments is this, from  
[www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/airports/palomar/masterplan.html](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/airports/palomar/masterplan.html) :

## Public Review Comments

**E-mail:** [PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:PalomarMP@sdcounty.ca.gov)

**Mail:** County of San Diego, Department of Public Works  
 Attn: Cynthia Curtis



**Comment Letter I22  
Exhibit**

5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410  
San Diego, CA 92123

Nowhere is there any information delineating the EIR Process, instructions, or any format with which to comment. This lack of information is unacceptable as the County is making a real effort to obtain community response. This needs to be corrected.

The proposed McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan will most likely have more impact on the people and the future of the San Diego North County than any other singular development in the area. Because the roll out of the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan does not match with the impact of Plan, I respectfully request an extension of 100 days from the date the above distribution and facilitations have been made.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Hope Nelson

C4fa Steering Committee

Carlsbad Citizen



**Response to Letter I22**

**Hope Nelson**

**I22-1** Please refer to **Master Response 2 (Public Review Period Extension)**. No further response is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Comment Letter I23

**From:** Kris Wright <kriswrt222@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 02, 2018 11:49 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** McClellan Palomar Airport Public Meeting

Hello,

I attended the Public meeting for the Palomar Airport Master Plan Update on January 30th at the Holiday Inn. During the public comment period, several people asked questions and were told that the FAA was not there to answer the questions being asked. **I'd like to ask that a representative from the FAA be present at the next Public Meeting on February 13, 2018 to answer all questions.**

I23-1

I am a long time resident of Carlsbad and my questions relate to information that was presented at that meeting.

Question:

The presentation included a slide that showed the area in the airport where the Community Noise Equivalent level (CNEL) at Palomar Airport would be at 65 CNEL. However, later in the forum, it was disclosed that there were no monitoring devices north of the airport-that there "used to be a device" but that there is nothing now. After the presentation one of the panel came up to me and said that there was another method to measure CNEL via Webtrak5. I was told during the forum that the Webtrak5 doesn't measure noise levels below 400 ft. So I am wondering how the study showing the northern border of the CNEL, north of McClellan Palomar Airport was accurate since there was no way to measure noise from ground level to 400 ft. All homes are certainly below 400 ft and I don't see how noise levels or the CNEL could be accurate as reported in the presentation.

I23-2

Comment:

Since the airport allows non commercial airplanes and corporate jets to land at all hours (no restrictions), I am concerned that the new proposal to expand the runway will encourage even more corporate jets and airplanes to land at our airport which will result in MORE noise, particulates and pollutants to become airborne which will contaminate our environment and safe living environments. This will affect the air quality of schools in the area, senior living homes-both populations that are very sensitive to health issues and changes in the levels of air quality. The ALT 5 preferred configuration would therefore allow MORE of the non-commercial, C-3 and D-3 jets to land and take off and my comment would be that the ideal configuration would be ALT 1, Stay at the B2 level and encourage the corporate jets at levels C3 and D3 or greater to land somewhere else. I am for keeping the airport small.

I23-3

Our population in north county is growing fast. The presentation at the public meeting stated that it was SAFER to have ALT 5. I of course, like most people prefer a safe airport but we would have to put a limit to the kind of jets arriving and taking off so that nearby residents in Carlsbad, San Marcos, Vista, Oceanside and other communities will not be exposed to the higher noise expected, the greater pollutants to the environment (which include airborne and seepage from oils, lead, gasoline, flammables, carcinogens, alkaloids into the soils which can then leach into our lagoon and ocean.

As a research scientist in the medical field with a major university, I am aware as to proper handling of hazardous materials and exposure to airborne contaminants. I am very concerned that the addition of larger non commercial airlines and corporate jets at the C-3 and D-3 levels will have a deleterious effect on our local population.

Thank you.

Kristine Wright  
 Laboratory Manager  
 University of California, San Diego

Carlsbad resident for 39 years.

--

Kris Wright  
[kriswrt222@gmail.com](mailto:kriswrt222@gmail.com)

**Response to Letter I23****Kristine Wright**

**I23-1** The County acknowledges the introductory comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required.

**I23-2** As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, existing noise contours surrounding the Airport were derived from detailed flight information gathered in 2016 (January 1–December 31, 2016). This included an evaluation of operational data provided by the County's Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System and FAA's Traffic Flow Management System Counts and Air Traffic Activity System. The noise contours were produced using the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT), the FAA's required model for evaluating noise impacts in the vicinity of airports. AEDT uses a variety of inputs to generate noise contours, including number of aircraft operations by type, types of aircraft, day/night time distribution by type, flight tracks, flight track and runway utilization by type, flight profiles, typical operational procedures, and average meteorological conditions. Ambient noise measurements were not used to produce the noise contours. More details on the noise model can be found in Appendix D to the PEIR. Also see **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)**.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff reviewed this comment for any site-specific location data of the perceived noise. However, the comment does not contain a sufficient location for the County to further study or analyze the noted noise concerns. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.

**I23-3** The comment asserts the runway extension will produce increased aircraft operations resulting in increased criteria pollutants. The commenter recommends Master Plan Update Alternative #1 to keep the Airport classification as B-II. The PEIR Chapter 3.1.2 does include an analysis of potential air quality emissions resulting from the Master Plan Update. The PEIR concluded that the Master Plan Update would not result in a significant air quality impact. As this comment does not specifically identify an environmental issue with the PEIR analysis or proposed mitigation, no changes to the PEIR have been made in response to this comment. Also, as discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight is the domain of the Federal Aviation Administration. Accordingly, neither San Diego County nor the City of Carlsbad has the authority to implement mandatory noise abatement procedures.

## Comment Letter I24

---

**From:** Donald Moore <dmdelmar@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:57 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** General Aviation Hangars

Dear Sirs:

It is imperative that provision is made in the plan to keep all of the currently installed general aviation hangars.

I24-1

Donald J Moore  
1059 Oliver Ave,  
San Diego, CA 92109  
1-858-342-4127  
dmdelmar@aol.com

Sent from my iPhone

**Response to Letter I24****Donald Moore**

- I24-1** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

## Comment Letter I25

**From:** Gail Carroll <justmailgail@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:47 AM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Airport Runway Development

For years I had attended PAAC meetings and collaborated with both officials at the airport and residents on solutions to the noise, safety and environmental effects of the airport as it exists and also future development.

I may have some small comfort level of added runway to allow larger and more planes come to Palomar if I only saw a larger commitment to the existing voluntary guidelines for both using the recommended flight departure plan to fly out over golf course, staying north of Palomar Airport Rd and making turns 1/2 mile west of coast and complying to quiet hours as follows:

### 24 Hour Voluntary Noise Abatement Procedures (VNAP)

**Jet takeoff and landing "QUIET HOURS" from 2200 – 0700 (L) All Aircraft takeoff and landing "QUIET HOURS" 0000 – 0600 (L)**

#### RUNWAY 24

Jets depart on 250° track, remain north of Palomar Airport Road until 1 mile offshore.

Props north and southbound depart on 250° track north of Palomar Airport Road until joining \*\*Coastal VFR Flyway. (ALPHA departure)

Eastbound props request right downwind departure. Hold turns until above 800' MSL. Fly downwind until above Class D airspace. Coordinate on course turns xing Rwy 24 final with Tower approval.

#### RUNWAY 06

All runway 06 north and southbound departures request left downwind. Climb to 800' MSL before turning downwind. Continue downwind north of Palomar Airport Road until joining \*\*Coastal VFR Flyway.

All runway 06 northeast through southeast departures fly runway heading until above 1500' MSL, then avoid noise sensitive areas.

Living south of Palomar Airport Rd, I witness daily and nightly planes flying over home and So of PS RD and departing before 6PM and after 10PM. We must close windows to talk on phone or hear TV far too often. We do fear one may drop from sky into homes or Poinsettia Elem school or Park. It surely detracts from the life style touted by the city and county.

It seems that the airport serves the minority that can afford private jets and businesses, rather than the residents that support the tax base which pays for the existence of this private air club.

I very strongly recommend that they spend their money and efforts trying to get the airport community on board to support the surrounding residents and neighbors by complying with the existing guidelines, instead of trying to further antagonize them and support those who habitually and flagrantly violate them, for their personal convenience, to the detriment of the taxpayers. This does not even mention the property values, traffic congestion and other safety issues that will be created by expansion of operations.



Bob & Gail Carroll  
1254 Mariposa Rd  
Carlsbad, CA 92011

REALTOR® Award of Excellence-Carlsbad  
SRES, Senior Real Estate Specialist  
[www.SeaCoastSanDiego.com](http://www.SeaCoastSanDiego.com)



Part of Richard Realty Groups CA BRE# 01458201  
Fine Coastal Homes... Outrageous Service  
Ph. 760.438.7747 Fax 760.603.8773

**Response to Letter I25****Bob and Gail Carroll**

- I25-1** As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, the Federal Aviation Administration has jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight. Accordingly, neither the County nor the City of Carlsbad has the authority to implement mandatory noise abatement procedures. Please refer to **Master Response 3 (Voluntary Noise Abatement Procedures)** and **Master Response 7 (FAA Involvement and Oversight)**. The comment will be included as part of the administrative record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.

Regarding the commenter's concern of aircraft noise, County staff researched the location provided by this comment and confirmed the location is outside of the 65dB contour (i.e., less than 65dB) under all scenarios. Specifically, the existing noise condition at the location provided was estimated to be 52.49dB, and its future condition without the Proposed Project is estimated to be 53.63dB. Assuming full implementation of the Proposed Project (PAL 2), the estimated future noise condition would be 54.61dB. This is below the threshold of significance of 65dB CNEL. Although the comment pertains to existing noise conditions, there is no evidence the Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts. Therefore, because the location would be outside of the 65dB contour, no significant noise impacts would occur, and no changes to the PEIR are required. Please refer to Master Responses 1 and 4 in addition to PEIR Appendix D for more information about the supplemental noise analysis conducted for additional locations.